	Case 3:07-cv-05373-FDB Document 10 File	d 10/01/07	Page 1 of 2	
1	1			
2	2			
3	3			
4	4			
5	5			
6	6			
7	7			
8	8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
0				
1	1 LEROY MORENO NAVARRO,			
2	Petitioner,	Casa No. (	C07-5373FDB	
3	3 v.		O SHOW CAUSE	
4	MAGGIE MILLER-STOUT	OKDEK I	O SHOW CAUSE	
5	Respondent.			
6				
7	This 28 U.S.C. & 2254 natition has been assigned	to the unders	signed Magistrate Judge.	
8	Datitionar has paid the filing fee and the patition is ready	Petitioner has paid the filing fee and the petition is ready for screening (Dkt. # 8).		
0	Upon screening the court notes petition is challenging a sentence that was handed down July			
1	18, 2000, (Dkt. # 9, petition, page 1). There was no appeal from the sentence or other collateral			
2	challenge until June 5, 2007 (Dkt. # 9, page 3) <sup>1</sup> .			
3	A one year statute of limitations was imposed on	A one year statute of limitations was imposed on habeas corpus petitions under the 1996		
4	amendments to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d), which were signed into law April 24, 1996 as part of the			
5	Antitarrariam and Effective Dooth Danelty Act (AEDDA)	. 28 U.S.C.	§ 2244(d) provides as follows:	
.6 .7	<sup>1</sup> Petitioner lists June 5, 2007, has the day he filed	his personal	restraint petition and as the	

ORDER- 1

1 2	(1) A 1-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of-			
3		(A) the date on which the judgment became final by conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review;		
4		(B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State		
5		action in violation of the constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such State action;		
6 7		(C) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.		
8	(2)	The time during which a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending shall not be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection		
	be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection.			
10	28 U.S.C.§ 2244 (d).			
11	Applying the statute to the information now before the court leads the court to believe this			
12	petition is time barred. As there was no direct challenge to the sentence, petitioner's sentence			
13	became final the date of sentencing, July 18, 2000. Petitioner had until July 19, 2001, to file a habeas			
14	corpus petition. The petition was not filed until July 25, 2007.			
15	Petitioner shall show cause why this petition should not be dismissed as time barred. A			
16	response is due on or before October 26, 2007.			
17	The clerk is directed to send copies of this order to petitioner and to note the October 26,			
18	<b>2007,</b> due date.			
19				
20	DATED this 28 day of September, 2007.			
21				
22				
23	<u>/S/ J. Kelley Arnold</u> J. Kelley Arnold			
24	United States Magistrate Judge			
25				
26				
27				
28	ORDER- 2			